

COPY

the first and second phase difference compensators compensate for the refractive index anisotropy of the liquid crystal molecules in a substantially horizontal orientation with respect to the surfaces of the first and second substrates in the absence of the applied voltage.

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and requests reconsideration of the subject application based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants also acknowledge with thanks the telephone interview with the Examiner regarding a proposed amendment to claim 4 and the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1-3 are allowed. Claims 4-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 and/or 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim 4 was amended to only address the Examiner's non-art based rejections. The Examiner, however, did note that in view of the §112 rejection of claim 4, for examination purposes claim 4 is considered as having a single phase difference plate as in the first office action.

Included herewith is a marked-up version of the amendments to the subject application by the current amendment. The marked-up versions are found on the pages captioned or entitled "Details of Amendments" that follow the signature page of the within Response.

COPY

35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph on the grounds that there are a number of antecedent basis/vagueness concerns in the identified claims. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the phrase "a phase difference compensator having two phase-delay axes parallel to each other and perpendicular to a phase-delay axis of the liquid crystal layer" was considered indefinite because two phase-delay axes in a single compensator would necessarily be a single axis not two axes.

As indicated above, claim 4 was amended in the foregoing amendment to address the concern identified by the Examiner. Applicant thus believes that the area of concern have been addressed in the foregoing amendment.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 and, as such, is in a condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103 REJECTIONS

Claims 4-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Koike at al [USP 5,745,206; "Koike"] as well as this combination of references in combination with other cited art for the reasons provided on pages 3- 7 of the above-referenced Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses as discussed below. Because claim 4 was amended in the instant amendment, the following discussion refers to the language of the amended claims. However, only those amended features specifically relied upon to distinguish

Applicant: F. Shimoshikiryoh
U.S.S.N.: 09/342,776
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION
Page 5

the claimed invention from the cited prior art shall be considered as being made to overcome the cited reference.

Applicant claims, claim 4, a liquid crystal display device that includes a first substrate and a second substrate at least one of which is transparent, a liquid crystal layer interposed between the first and second substrates, the layer being made of a nematic liquid crystal material having a positive dielectric anisotropy, a first electrode and a second electrode provided on the first and second substrates, respectively, for applying an electric field substantially vertical to the first and second substrates across the liquid crystal layer, and a first polarizing plate and a second polarizing plate each provided on an outer side of respective one of the first and second substrates, the first and second polarizing plates being arranged in a crossed Nicols arrangements.

The liquid crystal display also includes a first phase difference compensator provided between the first polarizing plate and the first substrate, and a second phase difference compensator provided between the second polarizing plate and the second substrate, wherein the phase-delay axes of the first and second phase difference compensators are parallel to each other and perpendicular to a phase-delay axis of the liquid crystal layer. The liquid crystal layer in each pixel region includes at least a first domain and a second domain in which liquid crystal molecules are oriented in different orientations. Whereby the first and second phase difference compensators compensate for the refractive index anisotropy of the liquid crystal molecules in a substantially horizontal orientation with respect to the surfaces of the first and second substrates in the absence of the applied voltage.

COPY

Applicant: F. Shimoshikiryoh
U.S.S.N.: 09/342,776
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION
Page 6

In view of the foregoing amendment to claim 4, Applicant renews the prior arguments provided in response to the First Office Action. Namely, that claim 4 was amended so as to further recite that the phase difference compensator has first and second phase-delay axes that are parallel to each other and perpendicular to a phase-delay axis of the liquid crystal layer and that the cited references do not teach the specific arrangement of phase-delay axes. Thus, and since claim 4 now recites such arrangements, the liquid crystal display device of claim 4 is therefore not taught or suggested by any of the cited references, alone or in combination, at least for this reason.

Further, it is recited with great clarity from page 77, line 21 to page 78, line 13 of the subject application, that in order to achieve the effect as recited in the last paragraph of claim 4, it is necessary to have an arrangement of axes and compensators as claimed. The cited references do not disclose such an arrangement of axes and compensators and hence it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not provide the effect of compensating for a refractive index anisotropy of liquid crystal molecules substantially horizontal in orientation with respect to the substrate surfaces.

It is respectfully submitted that for the foregoing reasons, claims 4-16 are patentable over the cited reference(s) and satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. As such, these claims are allowable.

COPY

Applicant: F. Shimoshikiryoh
U.S.S.N.: 09/342,776
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION
Page 7

DRAWING FIGURES

In the above-referenced Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the proposed drawing correction was approved. The Office Action further indicated that Applicant was required in reply to the Office Action.

In view of the indication of allowable subject matter and in the interests of advancing prosecution, Applicant herewith submits a formal drawing figure (FIG. 55) incorporating the approved drawing change. As such the drawing, as amended, is considered acceptable.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in a condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Applicant believes that additional fees are not required for consideration of the within Response. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
DIKE, BRONSTEIN, ROBERTS & CUSHMAN
Intellectual Property Practice Group

Date: December 30, 2002

By:



William J. Daley, Jr.
(Reg. No. 35,487)
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209
(617) 439- 4444